

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 12-14 have been elected for examination. Claims 3-7, 10-11 and 15-16 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 9 was found allowable.

The Examiner suggested a revision to the specification, citing 37 CFR 1.77(b). However, all of the information required by 37 CFR 1.77(b) is already present in the specification. No specific headings or other revisions are required.

The Examiner required a new title and a revised abstract, which are being supplied herein.

The Examiner objected to the drawings. A fresh copy of the drawings is enclosed. Headings in Fig. 4 have been rotated so as to comply with USPTO requirements.

Claims 9 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The rejections are traversed. In connection with claim 9, the Examiner cited the phrase "at least one holding device," but this phrase does not exist in claim 9. The Examiner is requested to review the actual language of claim 9 and withdraw this rejection. As for claims 12-14, the Examiner's only problem is that claim 12 depends alternatively from two parent claims, which is permitted under 35 USC 112, fifth paragraph. This rejection too should be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejected claims 12-14 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, under the enablement requirement. No specific questions about the claim language are presented in the Office Action. The Examiner said merely that the applying device of claim 12 is not described in the specification. The applying device is adequately described in paragraphs 0050-0051 and Fig. 1. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner failed to examine claims 12-14 because of the alleged non-enablement issue. Since there is no basis for any such non-enablement issue, any future rejection of claims 12-14 must be in a non-final Office Action, because these claims have not been given fair consideration in the present Office Action.

Claims 1-2 have been rejected as being anticipated by Akira et al. Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of claim 2, which is being canceled. Akira et al. neither discloses nor suggests the roller member with sloped side surface and the other features of original claim 2. The Examiner cited Akira's Fig. 9. The Akira reference is in Japanese, but the Examiner has not

translated anything from Akira's specification. No roller or rolling function is suggested by anything in Fig. 9. Accordingly, claim 1 is now considered to be allowable.

Allowance of claims 1, 8, 9 and 12-14 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EES FILING
SYSTEM ON June 5, 2009.



James A. Finder
Registration No.: 30,173
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

JAF:lf